

A DOCPHOENIX

INCOMING	INCOMING	APPL PARTS
ACPA	LET.	ARTIFACT
Continuing Prosecution Application	Misc Incoming Letter	Artifact
AP.B		CLM
Appeal Brief	IMIS Miscellaneous Internal Document	Claim
C680	PGEA	COMPUTER
Request for Corrected Notice/Allowance	Req Express Aband to avoid Publication	Computer Program Listing
C.AD	PGA9	CRFL
Change of Address	Req for Corrected Pat App Publication	CRF Transfer Request
CFILE	PGREF	CRFS
Request for Corrected Filling Receipt	Req for Refund of Publication Fee Paid	Computer Readable Form Statement
COCIN	PROTEST	DIST
Papers filed re Certificate of Corrections	Protest Documents Filed by 3 rd Party	Terminal Disdaimer Filed
CRFD	PROTRANS	DRW
Computer Readable Form Defective	Translation of Provisional in Nonprovioni	Drawings
CRFE	11/12/2003REM 2	FOR
Computer Readable Form 'ENTERED'	Applicant Remarks in Amendment	Foreign Reference
EABN	RESC	Foreign Priority Papers
Request for Express Abandonment	Rescind Non-Publication Request	
ELC	RETMAIL Mailed Returned by Post Office	IDS Including 1449
Response to Election/Restriction		NPL
IFEE	XT/ I	Non-Patent Literature
Issue Fee Transmittal PTOL 85 B		OATH
IRFND	APPL PARTS	Oath or Dedaration
Refund Request	371P	PET.
L_RIN Any Incoming to L&R	PCT Papers in a 371Application	Petition
N417	_ A	PGPUB DRAWINGS_
	Amendment Including Elections	Box PG Pub Drawings
Copy of EFS Receipt Acknowledgement	•	SEQLIST
N/AP	After Final Amendment	Sequence Listing
Notice of Appeal		SPEC
PAChange in Power of Attorney	A.PE Preliminary Amendment	Specification Specification
·	ABST	SPEC NO
PC/I Power to Make Copies or to Inspect	Abstract	Specification Not in English
	ADS	
PEF. Pre-Exam Formalities Response	Application Data Sheet	
PEFRREISS	AF/D	
Pre-Exam Formalities Reissue Response	Affidavit or Exhibit Received	
PERSEO	APPENDIX	

Appendix

Pre-Exam Formalities Sequence Reply

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application with all claims being rejected in the present Final Office Action.

Claims 1-6, 12-16, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,946,257 (Keeth). Claims 7-11 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Keeth in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,027 (Sher).

Keeth describes a memory circuit, which includes distributed voltage generators to selectively provide power to memory arrays of the memory circuit.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the text in column 9, lines 60-65 of Keeth reading:

"This method of array control provides the benefit of flexible fabrication. That is, as integrated circuits become bigger, power distribution becomes more difficult. The requirements of a single voltage generator for an entire circuit would be impractical to meet. Thus, using distributed voltage generators provides a more efficient manner of adjusting an integrated circuit than a series of isolation switches"

does not disclose "at least one enable/disable circuit for selectively connecting and disconnecting at least a portion of the respective macro from the integrated circuit system" recited in Claim 1 as amended or "means for controlling the means coupled to the means for receiving the external voltage according to an enable/disable signal to selectively connect and disconnect at least a portion of the respective macro of the plurality of macros" recited in Claim 12 as filed.

By stating in column 9, lines 64-67: "Thus, using distributed voltage generators provides a more efficient manner of adjusting an integrated circuit than a series of isolation switches" Keeth teaches away from the above stated recitations of independent Claims 1 and 12.

Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-5, 12-16, 21, and 22, it is submitted that they overcome Keeth by virtue of their dependencies on independent Claims 1 and 12. Furthermore, without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 7-11, and 17-20, it is submitted that they overcome Keeth, Sher, and the combination thereof by virtue of their dependencies on independent Claims 1 and 12. Accordingly it is submitted that Claims 1-5, 12-16, 21, and 22 are patentable over Keeth and Claims 7-11, and 17-20 are patentable over Keeth in view of Sher.